



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,858	11/29/2001	Bruce A. Makinen	10011293-1	6713
7590	05/06/2004		EXAMINER	
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			CABRERA, ZOILA E	
Legal Department, DL429			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Intellectual Property Administration				
P.O. Box 7599			2125	
Loveland, CO 80537-0599			DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/997,858	MAKINEN, BRUCE A.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Zoila E. Cabrera	2125		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 36-58 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Final Rejection

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

The 102 rejection with respect to claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, 15-17, 19-22, 24-26, 28-29 and 30 is maintained.

The 103, rejection regarding claims 5, 14 and 23 is maintained.

New claims 32-58 are presented for consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, 15-17, 19-22, 24-26, 28-29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Minard (US 6,247,020)**.

Minard discloses a method, system and readable medium for managing interaction with a presentation of a tree structure in a graphical user interface, the method comprising the steps of:

Regarding claims 1-4, 10-13, 19-22 and 28-29, **Minard** discloses,

- displaying a tree structure on a first portion of a graphical user interface (Fig. 4A, element 410; Col. 8, lines 64-67);
receiving a search request for an object in the tree structure having a predefined value via a second portion of the graphical user interface (Col. 12, lines 49-52);
displaying a search result in a third portion of the graphical user interface, the

search result comprising one or more locations that satisfy the search request (Col. 12, lines 53-55; Figs. 4A-4B, elements 410, 430 and 450, i.e., Navigation, Structure and Content Panes; Col. 9, lines 4-6. Please note that the 3 panes are synchronized to point to the same node or selected object); and in response to selection of one of the locations, modifying the tree structure to display the selected location of the object having the predefined value (Col. 12, lines 55-57; Col. 9, lines 4-6; Col. 13, lines 57-67 to Col. 14, lines 1-8);

- the step of modifying the tree structure to display the selected location comprises expanding the tree structure (Fig. 4A, element 430; Col. 8, lines 50-51);
- the step of modifying the tree structure to display the selected location comprises highlighting the object having the predefined value (Col. 11, lines 34-36);
- the step of receiving a search request for an object comprises the step of receiving text via a text box displayed in the second portion of the graphical user interface (Col. 12, lines 51-54).

With respect to claims 6-8, 15-17, 24-26 and 30, **Minard** further discloses,

- the tree structure comprises one or more parent objects, at least one of the parent objects having one or more child objects (Figs. 4A-4B, 6A);
- the tree structure represents the contents of a computer (Figs. 4A-4B);
- the tree structure comprises a root object, one or more first-level objects, one or more second-level objects, and one or more third level objects (Fig. 6B, element 620).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 5, 14 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Minard (US 6,247,020)**.

Minard discloses the limitations of claims 1, 10, 19 and 28 above and further discloses, regarding claims 5, 14 and 23, the use of a pop-up window with a class hierarchy option (Col. 12, lines 34-38; Fig. 6A, element 610). However, **Minard** fails to disclose that *the third portion* of the graphical user interface comprises a pop-up window. But it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a pop-up window as taught by **Minard** for displaying the results on the third portion because it would provide an improved system wherein the user can easily select among different files and packages (**Minard**, Col. 12, lines 47-48).

4. Claims 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Minard (US 6,247,020)** in view of Applicant's Admitted prior art (Specification, Page 2, lines 11-23).

Minard discloses the limitations of claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 above but fails to disclose, regarding claims 32-35, the tree structure correlates to a model of a printed circuit board used in an x-ray inspection control system, the printed circuit board having one or more components having one or more pins soldered to the printed circuit board. However, Applicant admits, on Page 2 of the Specification, lines 11-23, that a graphical user interface used in current PCB inspections systems typically employs a display of a

tree structure to aid in the inspection process. Applicant further admits that the graphical user interface may include a display of one or more objects corresponding to a pin object that specifies a unique pin number for a specific component. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Minard** with the current PCB inspection systems using tree structures because it would provide a user a quick navigation tool to the various structural elements in the file and it will also provide a user a much faster way to browse and find the elements of a file (**Minard**, Col. 11, lines 30-31 and 41-42).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 36-58 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed March 4, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends, regarding claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 that "the user interface of **Minard** displays both the alleged tree structure and the alleged search result in the same portion of its user interface" and further argues that a "search result comprising one or more locations that satisfy the search request" is not displayed in either of the **Minard** Structure or Content panes. Examiner disagrees because **Minard** clearly teaches that "The actual view of the current node (from the Navigation pane) is shown

in the Content pane 450" (Col. 9, lines 64-65). Minard further discloses that "The content pane displays the detailed content of the file selected in the Navigation pane" (Col. 10, lines 16-17). Please note that the files with the search word in them are displayed in a new Navigation pane, and the actual view of the current node from the Navigation pane is shown in the Content pane 450, to see the Java source code in the Content pane. Therefore, Minard discloses "displaying a tree structure on a first portion of a graphical user interface" (Fig. 4A, element 410) and "displaying a search result in a third portion of the graphical user interface, the search result comprising one or more locations that satisfy the search request" (Fig. 4A, elements 430 and 450; Col. 9, lines 4-6. Please note that the 3 panes are synchronized to point to the same node or selected object).

Applicant further contends, regarding claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 that Minard fails to disclose "displaying a tree structure on a first portion of a graphical user interface" and "in response to selection of one of the locations, modifying the tree structure to display the selected location of the object having the predefined value". Examiner disagrees because Minard discloses that the Navigation pane 410 displays a tree 411 comprising a single parent node that may have children wherein the parent may or may not be visible but the children always are (Col. 8, lines 64-66). Minard further discloses that "Each child may *also be a parent* of other arbitrary nodes". Therefore, by selecting a child node that is also a parent of other nodes, the tree structure is modified to display the selected location of the object having the predefined value.

Applicant agrees, with respect to claims 3, 12, and 21 that Minard discloses "the user can then click on any of those elements in the structure pane and the content pane will move to and highlight that element in the source code" (Col. 11, lines 34-36). Applicant, however, disagrees that the highlighted in Minard are not "locations that satisfy a search request". Examiner disagrees because Minard states that selection of a node in the Navigation pane synchronizes the Structure and Content pane to point to the same node. Therefore the results of the Navigation, Content and Structure panes are one or more locations that satisfy a search request. Minard discloses "highlighting the object having the predefined value" (Fig. 4B, element 463 and 461; Col. 11, lines 34-41).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Zoila Cabrera, whose telephone number is (703) 306-4768. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. EST (every other Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by phone fail, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached on (703) 308-0538. Additionally, the fax phones for Art Unit 2125 are (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist at (703) 305-9600.

Zoila Cabrera
Patent Examiner
5/4/04



LEO PICARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100